R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 018 006 EA 001 207

"QUESTIONS AS BIG AS THE WORLD AND AS ENDURING AS ETERNITY."

BY- MORSE, WAYNE

PUB DATE 14 NOV 67

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$0.48 10P.

DESCRIPTORS- *HIGHER EDUCATION, EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES, *EDUCATIONAL FINANCE, *FINANCIAL PROBLEMS, *FEDERAL AID, LUNCH PROGRAMS, FELLOWSHIPS, FACILITY EXPANSION, BUDGETS, *EDUCATIONAL POLICY, FEDERAL LEGISLATION, LAND GRANT UNIVERSITIES, STATE UNIVERSITIES, COLUMBUS,

NATIONAL INTEREST CALLS FOR MORE ADEQUATELY MEETING OPERATIONAL AND CAPITAL COSTS OF HIGHER EDUCATION. SOME OF THE CONSEQUENCES OF THE DECREASED FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION ARE DISCUSSED AND PROPOSALS FOR POLICY CONSIDERATIONS ARE ADVANCED. AMONG THE AREAS MOST INFLUENCED BY INADEQUATE FEDERAL SUPPORT ARE SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAMS, COMMUNITY SERVICES, UNIVERSITY EXTENSION PROGRAMS, NDEA FELLOWSHIPS, FACILITIES CONSTRUCTION, THE INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION ACT, THE TEACHER CORPS, AND THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT. PROPOSALS ADVANCED FOR POLICY CONSIDERATION INCLUDE--(1) AID PROPOSED SHOULD ENCOMPASS BOTH PUBLIC AND PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION, (2) RECOGNITION SHOULD BE GIVEN TO THE ADVISABILITY OF EXTENDING SUPPORT TO ALL INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION, (3) PROVISION SHOULD BE MADE FOR EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF AID TO ALL GEOGRAPHICAL AREAS OF THIS COUNTRY IN TERMS OF THE STUDENTS EACH INSTITUTION SERVES, (4) RECOGNITION SHOULD BE GIVEN TO THE COSTLY NATURE OF RESEARCH ACTIVITIES, AND ADDITIONAL LEVELS OF COMPENSATION SHOULD BE AWARDED FOR THIS PURPOSE, AND (5) IN ADOPTING A PROGRAM, IT WOULD BE WELL TO INCORPORATE INTO THE FORMULA A MAXIMUM CEILING FOR FUNDING IN ANY ONE YEAR TO ANY ONE INSTITUTION. THIS ADDRESS WAS DELIVERED TO THE GENERAL SESSION OF THE JOINT CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE UNIVERSITIES AND LAND-GRANT COLLEGES AND THE ASSOCIATION OF STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES (COLUMBUS, OHIO, NOVEMBER 14, 1967). (HW)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED018006

EA 001 207

Address of Senator Wayne Morse (D.-Ore.)
Chairman, Education Subcommittee
Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

To the
General Session of the Joint Convention
National Association of State Universities
and Land-Grant Colleges
Association of State Colleges and Universities

11:00 A. M. Tuesday, November 14, 1967
Columbus, Ohio

"QUESTIONS AS BIG AS THE WORLD AND AS ENDURING AS ETERNITY"

President Jensen, Distinguished Guests, Members of the Associations, and friends:

We live it seems in the decade of the centennial observance. So many advances made in the past 100 years are being reviewed, as in area after area courses are charted for the next moves forward.

This is as it should be. We can gain a perspective, if we pause to look back from where we started, so that we can gain for the time that it takes to breathe, a respite from the pressure to move onward to our dimly seen goals.

This great audience of distinguished men and women who are dedicated to understanding and transmitting the knowledge of the past, and through that understanding transmuting it and minting it anew for each generation of students, is visible proof that an idea can become reality through faith and works.

For it took both to bring into being the great institutions of learning which comprise your Associations. You are a great national treasure and a unique national resource whose value increases each

year to all of our citizens. You are a national treasure, because from your laboratories, your libraries and classrooms come the men and women who serve all of their fellow citizens, in industry, government, labor, business and agriculture. Surely these products of your teaching are the only lasting treasure that a nation can have.

You are a unique resource, because of your origins. You carry on proudly the American tradition of democracy. You are not ashamed to stem from the colleges of the mechanic arts of your founding, for you realize that the dream of the architect must be based upon engineering principles, that the voice of the advocate or the hand of the surgeon is to be used in the service of the client, unstintingly, and regardless of ability to pay.

This is the goldsmith hallmark of the professional. That he performs his service to meet and answer human needs. It is a sign of the discipline you have accepted that you do not measure the quality of your offering by the monetary reward you receive.

So I salute you for the past services each of you, and each of your associations has rendered to the common good. I thank you as the representative of the people of the United States for the contributions you have made in every area and discipline. I am confident that in more than full measure you will fulfill the tasks and obligations that the century ahead will bring.

It is fitting that a prophetic voice of forty years ago should again be heard on an occasion such as this: Does the metal of it still ring true?

> "Secondary education is asleep. It is dreaming of I. Q.'s, of discipline as against supervision, of conformity to the requirements for college, of methodologies, of pedagogies, of the isness of many inconsequential whys--but for questions as big as the world and as enduring as eternity, she has neither eye nor ear. Human relationships, the struggle against war, the economic chaos of the world, hate between races and religions, the moral delapidation of mankind, the disintegration of the fireside, the apparent triumph of the material over the spiritual--all these receive but a passing glance."

John Dewey spoke of secondary education, but in a sense, it applies, or should apply, to all educational endeavor. These larger questions are your grist for milling. Your primary function is to equip each generation of your students with the intellectual tools they need to fashion their answers based upon principle, to these eternal questions.

So although I recognize the necessity of setting forth on a value free basis, that which is, I regard this only as a prerequisite for the more vital measurement, the assessment of the existing against the model of what ought to be.

We can take comfort, some comfort at least, that the 1960's have, as never before, reflected the concern of the American people for the need to expand at every level educational opportunities for all of our young people.

More young Americans now are attending better schools and are being exposed to more information at every level from pre-kindergarten through post-graduate study than any predecessor generation. But this is not enough.

Despite more than a billion dollars of Federal aid which was added to the elementary and secondary school budgets of a few of our

schools, urban and rural, who needed it most, as a Senator, I feel my efforts have been inadequate when I am told in our hearings:

> "In one community, for example, a principal received ESEA funds to provide free school lunches for 100 children for each day of the school year. But there were 300 eligible children in the school. In order to distribute the school lunches equally, the principal decided to feed all 300 children once every three days rather than feeding 100 children every day. There was considerable concern in the community because the Negro parents could not understand why their children did not get fed every day. This is fairly typical of the lack of communication between the school and the community and it is indeed unfortunate."

It is very hard to see how a remedial reading program can get started and work well unless first the physiological need of the child for food is met. Obviously in that school system, the greatest improvement they could hope for would follow from the installation of what most of us thought was a standard program since the 1930s. I have been voting for school lunch programs every Congress since I entered the Senate, and I am appalled that we have not yet managed to provide sufficient resources from the agricultural abundance your schools have brought into being through the work you have done with the American farmer, to clear from the learning path of some of our children this unnecessary and morally indefensible obstruction.

What relevance has this for you? Ask yourself what you did when the appropriations bill for agriculture was up? You supported, I am sure, the school lunch program, but were you not more concerned with items more immediately related to your operations?

In the second century of your service to the American people do you not have an enlarged responsibility to make better known to the Congress and to your State legislatures the findings of your

research in urban and rural sociology, the results of your inter-disciplinary studies, so that effective programs can be developed to meet these human needs?

If you enlarge your horizons to reach into and criticize constructively the ways things are being done, if you develop and advocate sound solutions to these problems, using as tools the authorities such as those contained in Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 relating to community service and university extension programs, then you will help to create for your many other concerns the climate of opinion which can assist you in solving your institutional financial problems.

I have spoken of your institutions as being a national resource, well aware that a national resource whether it be timber, water-power, ore or oil, can be harvested and conserved or it can be willfully and shockingly wasted through exploitation.

To discharge the responsibilities I am suggesting will require an additional commitment of money and talent, if other areas of equal validity are not be cut back or ignored. I propose to help you in every way that I can to develop new sources of financing through additions to existing legislative authorities, not because of your institutions per se, but because I am convinced that it is in the interest of all of our citizens that we develop better ways of providing a full range of educational opportunity to our young people.

But I put to you the necessity of your effort with your Senators and Congressmen to obtain the full appropriation of the presently authorized programs as well.

Let us first take a look at the specifics.

Title IV NDEA Fellowships

Currently 7500 NDEA fellowships are authorized, that is to say that budget estimates sufficient to support that number can be submitted.

The President asked only for 5,460 new fellowships for fiscal 1968, the current fiscal year at a cost, for these and for funding the second and third year costs of the 12,000 fellowships previously awarded, of $96.6 million.

The signed appropriations bill carried only $86.6 million.

What are the results? You know them only too well.

The answer I received when I asked the question of the Office of Education was:

> "Should the requested appropriation of $96,000,000 be reduced by $10,000,000 to $86,000,000 for Fiscal Year 1968, the number of students who could enter the first year of the three-year period of college teacher training in September, 1968 would be reduced from 5,460 to 3,325 (since the second and third year commitments to 12,000 students already in tenure represent a continuing prior obligation of the NDEA Title IV program).
>
> "The practical effect would be to reduce by 45 per cent of the level of first year support available to the universities and graduate colleges of the United States in the training of future college and university teachers. Every one of the 193 leading graduate schools of the 50 States would find their level of support for first year fellows reduced by approximately 45 percent in 1968-69 as compared with 1967-68 should the requested appropriation for FY 1968 be reduced from $96,000,000 to $86,000,000.
>
> "The impact of this sharp reduction in the first year support for the training of college and university teachers comes at a time of sharply increasing need for teachers trained at the doctoral level in our

rapidly expanding national network of junior colleges, four year colleges, senior colleges, and public and private universities. The proposed 45 percent reduction in first year NDEA Title IV fellowships comes at the same time as projected reductions in most other Federal programs for pre-doctoral training of scientists and scholars to meet our rising national need for specialists trained at the doctoral level."

Academic Facilities Construction

The Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 has helped to build many libraries and classrooms. It is authorized at $728 million for this year. The appropriation for fiscal year 1968 was $459.7 million Testimony on construction needs for academic facilities from college and university witnesses suggests a total capital investment need of about $4.375 billion each year, if we are to admit the students who apply under current standards of acceptability.

The contrast between the provision made and the model of what ought to be provided is pretty clear.

Yet you and your colleagues are the only ones who can make clear to the Congress that curtailment in this area is surely penny-wise pound-foolish economy.

Your boards of trustees ought to be pointing this out too, to the newspaper editors of this country and to the banking community. For education is a good investment of the public funds. It returns a higher dividend than almost anything else to our economy.

Other Areas of Underfunding

The International Education Act is the prime example of a program of promise and potentiality which has been birth-strangled through non-funding. Your Congress would not even give the Act seed money to start its operations.

The Teacher Corps received $13.5 million rather than the $33 million asked for by the President.

Only half of the $2.4 billion appropriations for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act authorization was funded.

These are examples of areas where you could, and in my view should have a great concern. Your students are those who come from the nation's public schools. Unless the quality of their preparation is high, you are saddled with the costs of remedial work.

So I would counsel you to watch the budget that is submitted in January for next year. Analyze the implications contained in it early and make known vigorously your views upon the adequacy of the funding proposed. In your meetings adopt measures which will let your professional staff who are very able and dedicated keep you informed so that you can act at each key point in the process with maximum effect.

But beyond this, and for the future, for the long haul as we leave this century and enter the next, I believe that the national interest calls for a new departure for meeting more adequately the operational as well as the capital costs of higher education.

We shall soon be in hearings on the Higher Education Amendments of 1967. If your deliberations at this meeting produce recommendations for a beginning in this area of future financial assistance, I shall be delighted to hear your witnesses in the course of those hearings.

Let me share with you some of the policy considerations which such proposals should contain if, in my judgment, they are to command effective support in the Senate.

First, the aid proposed should encompass both public and private institutions of higher education.

Second, it should recognize the advisability of support being extended to all institutions of higher education whether they be 2 year, 4 year, or university level including those aggregates of 4 year undergraduate institutions which have ties with a common graduate center.

Third, provision should be made for equitable distribution of the aid given in terms of the students each serves to all geographical areas of this country, with particular stress in building graduate capacity in those areas which now have limited capabilities in this area.

Fourth, recognition should be given to the costly nature of research activities and additional levels of compensation should be awarded for this function.

Sixth, because of the historic development of higher education in this country certain of our institutions along the eastern seaboard and on the Pacific Coast have attained a pre-eminence which has resulted in their becoming in recent years the prime receivers of Federal funds from our defense and space agencies and from the National Science Foundation. This is understandable and by no means, in my judgment, improper. But one of the attributes of a politician is the ability to count legislative and appropriations noses. I would strongly urge that for adoption of a program and the initial and continued funding of a program, it would be well to incorporate into the formula a maximum ceiling for funding in any one year, to any one institution.

I have been reviewing draft legislation of this character. It would be my hope that the uses to which such funds as are generated under the formula approach I have briefly sketched could be put would be a broadly permissive nature, one patterned after the operation and maintenance language which governs the present use of P. L. 874 funds to local school districts in our Federally impacted areas programs, but I would also hope that it would contain a recognition that the land-grant college concept, so successful in agriculture, could be itself transmuted into an equivalent ideal of service to the metropolitan areas which house an ever increasing proportion of our population.

If with your help, we can evolve a new program of broadly based support for our colleges, your successors who meet here or elsewhere in the year 2067 will have cause to sing your praises.

And as a consequence of the benefits such a program would bring to the nation and to the world it would be my hope that they could answer Dewey with the ringing affirmation that in our time we had not failed to put the eternal questions strongly and matched them with our appropriate and compassionate answers.

###